

REMARKS

In reply to the Office Action dated March 28, 2003, Applicants amend claims 1-7, 10, 15, and 17-30, and cancel claim 9. Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced by amendments to claims 1-8, 10, 15, and 17-30. Claims 1-8 and 10-30 are now pending in the application.

§ 112 REJECTION OF CLAIM 28

The Examiner rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for a minor error. Applicants have amended the claim in accordance with the Examiner's remarks.

§ 102(e) Rejection

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 7, 19, 22, 29, and 30 and dependent claims 2-5, 9, 11, 13, 14, 20, 24, 26, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,455,953 to Russell. Applicants respectfully traverses the rejection of those claims and submits that as amended the claims are patentable over Russell.

Applicants respectfully submit that Russell does not disclose, teach or suggest at least using a key where the "key is a symmetric key that the sending client uses to encrypt the multicast event and the receiving client uses to decrypt the multicast event," as recited in claim 1. In the Office Action, the Examiner cites to various sections of Russell as allegedly showing all of the aspects of claim 1 before amendment. Russell describes an authorization mechanism for providing authorization information for a client requesting access to a server resource. (Abstract). Russell provides detail on how in one step a client may gain access rights, using a ticket, to a server resource. Such a ticket is not a symmetric key that the sending client uses to encrypt the event and the

receiving client uses to decrypt the event. Thus, Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over Russell.

As amended, claim 7 recites "wherein the key is a symmetric key that the sending client uses to encrypt the multicast event and the receiving client uses to decrypt the multicast event." This language is substantially similar to amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submits that claim 7 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth in connection with amended claim 1.

As amended, claim 19 recites "wherein the key is a symmetric key used to encrypt the multicast event and used by the client to decrypt the event." This language is substantially similar to amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submits that claim 19 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth in connection with amended claim 1.

As amended, claim 22 recites "wherein the key is a symmetric key that the sending client uses to encrypt the event and the receiving client uses to decrypt the event." This language is substantially similar to amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submits that claim 22 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth in connection with amended claim 1.

As amended, claim 29 recites "wherein the key is a symmetric key used to encrypt the event and used by the client to decrypt the event." This language is substantially similar to amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submits that claim 29 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth in connection with amended claim 1.

As amended, claim 30 recites "wherein the key is a symmetric key used to encrypt the event and used by the client to decrypt the event." This language is

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

substantially similar to amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submits that claim 30 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth in connection with amended claim 1.

Claims 2-5 each depend from independent claims 1, and are thus allowable for at least the reasons set forth in connection with independent claim 1 from which they depend. Claims 9, 11, 13, and 14 each depend from independent claim 7, and are thus allowable for at least the reasons set forth in connection with independent claim 7 from which they depend. Claim 20 depends from independent claims 19, and is thus allowable for at least the reasons set forth in connection with independent claim 19 from which it depends. Claims 24, 26, and 27 each depend from independent claim 22, and are thus allowable for at least the reasons set forth in connection with independent claim 22 from which they depend. ,

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION OF CLAIM 6
OVER RUSSELL IN VIEW OF MASSARANI**

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,455,953 to Russell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,484 to Massarani (OA, p. 10). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submit that claim 6, as it now stands, is patentable over the cited references, alone or in combination.

Massarani describes a database that stores a list of IP addresses and other user identification and associated parameters. (Abstract). Massarani does not disclose using a key where the "key is a symmetric key that the sending client uses to encrypt the event and the receiving client uses to decrypt the event." Claim 6 depends ultimately from claim 1. As discussed above, Applicants submit that claim 1 (and therefore also claim 6) is patentable over Russell because Russell neither teaches nor discloses "a

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

symmetric key that the sending client uses to encrypt the event and the receiving client uses to decrypt the event," as recited by claim 1. Furthermore, Massarani does not cure this deficiency. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 6 is patentable over Russell and Massarani, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons stated above.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION OF CLAIM 8, 10, 12, 16-18, 21, 23, and 25
OVER RUSSELL IN VIEW OF WOLLRATH**

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 10, 12, 16-18, 21, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,455,953 to Russell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,519,615 to Wollrath (OA, p. 11). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that claims 8, 10, 12, 16-18, 21, 23, and 25, as they now stand, are patentable over the cited references, alone or in combination.

Wollrath describes methods and systems for leasing storage locations in a distributed processing system. (Abstract). Wollrath does not disclose using a key where the "key is a symmetric key that the sending client uses to encrypt the event and the receiving client uses to decrypt the event." Claims 8, 10, 12, 16-18, 21, 23, and 25 depend ultimately from independent claims 7, 19, and 22. As discussed above, Applicants submit that claims 7, 19, and 22 (and therefore also claims 8, 10, 12, 16-18, 21, 23, and 25) are patentable over Russell because Russell neither teaches or discloses "a symmetric key that the sending client uses to encrypt the event and the receiving client uses to decrypt the event." Furthermore, Wollrath does not cure this deficiency. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 8, 10, 12, 16-18, 21, 23, and 25 are patentable over Russell and Wollrath, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons stated above.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION OF CLAIM 15
OVER RUSSELL IN VIEW OF YUASA**

The Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,455,953 to Russell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,085,238 to Yuasa (OA, p. 14). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that claim 15, as it now stands, is patentable over the cited references, alone or in combination.

Yuasa describes a virtual LAN system that may include a multicast communication (Abstract, Col. 21, lines 34-51). Yuasa does not disclose using a key where the "key is a symmetric key that the sending client uses to encrypt the event and the receiving client uses to decrypt the event." Claim 15 depends ultimately from claim 7. As discussed above, Applicants submit that claim 7 (and therefore also claim 15) is patentable over Russell because Russell neither teaches or discloses "a symmetric key that the sending client uses to encrypt the event and the receiving client uses to decrypt the event," as recited by claim 7. Furthermore, Yuasa does not cure this deficiency. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 15 is patentable over Russell and Yuasa, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons stated above.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER ^{LLP}

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 28, 2003

By: 
Karna J. Nisewaner
Reg. No. 50,665

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com